

---

Subject: Re: Is ploop stable/Any progress on quotas for simfs

Posted by [HHawk](#) on Thu, 16 Jan 2020 10:55:55 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

websavers wrote on Sat, 11 January 2020 21:28seanfulton wrote on Sat, 11 January 2020 13:40What sort of overhead are you seeing with PLOOP containers? Right now I am migrating a CENTOS6 container and the container's disk usage shows 500M but df on the drive it is on is showing 1.2G of usage.

Here's a few containers we currently have for comparison. The first number is the total storage of all files in the container.

- WS2-163: 64.68 GB of 150 GB used -- du reports 78GB = 17% overhead
- WS2-230: 65.38 GB of 100 GB used -- du reports 77GB = 15% overhead
- WS2-253: 2.55 GB of 15 GB used -- du reports 4.3GB = 41% overhead
- WS2-301: 45.06 GB of 75 GB used -- du reports 54GB = 17% overhead

Assuming 41% is an outlier, and/or more likely to be a problem on smaller containers (which I believe is accurate from what I've seen), we're talking an average of 16% overhead. If you've got a 2TB drive, that means you've lost over 327GB to ploop overhead which in the above examples could easily be used for 4-6 more containers. Whereas if it were closer to 5% you'd only be losing 100GB, which would be an easier loss to stomach, given the advantages of ploop.

Similar results here. One time we even have an overhead of almost 1.5 TB, because of resizing the ploop (backup) container.

I still prefer SimFS, but alas we have no real choice. Never had these issues with SimFS. Always had the space which was in use.